05/31/02 FRI :13 [TX/RX NO 7015] \$002

GROUP 1600

OFFICIAL

OFFICIAL

PATENT Our Docket: P-HP 3808

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of Watson-Straughan et al. Serial No: 09/632,928 Filed: August 4, 2000

For: TRIAMINE DERIVATIVE

MELANOCORTIN RECEPTOR LIGANDS AND METHODS OF USING SAME

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C.

Examiner: S. Barts

I heraby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted with the United States Patent and Trademark Office by facsimile on May 31. 2002.

David I. Spolter, Reg. No. 36,933

May 31, 2002 Date of Signature

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Responsive to the Office Action mailed April 23, 2002, entry of the following Remarks is respectfully requested. A response was initially due by May 23, 2002. However, a petition for extension, requesting an extension of one month, or until June 23, 2002, along with the corresponding extension fee, is submitted herewith. Accordingly, this response is timely filed.

Regarding the restriction requirement.

The Action further restricts the claims into two additional groups:

- I. Claims 1 to 19, directed to compounds; and
- II. Claim 42, directed to compositions.

In response to the restriction, Applicants elect Group I, claims 1 to 19, directed to compounds.

However, Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction and request that original Groups I and II be rejoined. As will be recalled, originally the claims were restricted into two groups, 1) claims 1 to 19 and 42, directed to compounds; and 2) claims 20 to 41, directed to methods of treatment. As a basis for this restriction, citing MPEP sec. 806.05(h), the previous Office Action alleged that the claimed product can be used in a materially different process of using that product.

In response, Applicants respectfully pointed out that MPEP sec. 806.05(h) also states that "The burden is on the examiner to provide an example" of such a method. The previous Office Action, as well as the current one, provides no such example. Accordingly, no proper basis for the original restriction is provided and, therefore,

18690 657 858

rejoinder of original Groups I and II is respectfully requested.

Alternatively, because no example of a materially different method is provided in either this or the previous Action, as it must, Applicants respectfully request that one method be rejoined with the elected Group I of compounds. Specifically, Applicants request rejoining the claims directed to methods of altering the activity of a melanocortin receptor, claims 20 to 30.

Additionally, Applicants wish to acknowledge that the present Office Action states that once a genus or subgenus of compounds is found allowable, the Examiner will rejoin a composition claim (i.e., the full breadth of claim 42, as originally filed) of corresponding scope of what is allowed.

Regarding the species election.

Having elected, with traverse, Group I for examination, Applicants wish to remind the Examiner of the elction of species, specifically, the formula shown in claim 1,

$$R_8$$
 R_7
 R_6
 R_1
 R_2
 R_3
 R_4

wherein:

 R_1 , R_2 , R_4 , R_5 and R_7 are hydrogen;

R₃ is chloro;

R₆ is (4-iodophenyl) methyl;

 R_8 is the formula X-CH-Y, wherein the adjoining nitrogen depicted in the formula of claim 1 is directly attached to the carbon atom of the formula X-CH-Y, and wherein:

X is 3-guanidinopropyl; and

Y is aminomethyl; and

n is 1.

CONCLUSION

In light of the Remarks herein, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are now in condition for allowance and requests a notice to this effect. Should the Examiner have any questions, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 31, 2002

David I. Spolter

Registration No. 36,933

Telephone No. (858) 459-2934 Facsimile No. (858) 459-0698

LAW OFFICE OF DAVID SPOLTER 1590 Coast Walk La Jolla, California 92037